VSP Public Comment

From: Mary Clark [marwes@accessbee.com]

Sent: Monday, June 27, 2005 6:30 PM

To: McDannold, Bruce

Subject: Fw: Electronic Voting Machines

Dear Sir,

You have an awesome task ahead of you; having to deal with citizens who want to ensure their vote counts and that they can trust you to carry out this task. On the other hand you have vendors who, it seems, want to relieve you and other officials of this responsibility by taking complete control of input and output for our elections.

We want the system if it's a reliable system, BUT we do not want the operators. In order for the elections to be valid (honest) we need independent individuals who are independent of the actual vendors to operate systems and who are selected by people in the employ of our State. We do not want a proprietary system—we do not trust such an arrangement. Must have open local access and security.

We have to have a system that can be manually counted – a paper trail that stays in the actual voting place after the voter votes not something that has gone over internet and then is printed. If this is not possible with electronic system, then there has to be a revote using another medium that can be audited, counted and recounted if necessary. Cost !! If electronic vendors can't provide an auditable verifiable machine count then they must be held responsible for picking up the cost of revote. A contract is a contract and it is a two-way deal. You perform—we pay you; you don't perform to California laws and voting specifications—you pay our state for expenses involved in trying to validate an election.

Based on current data, we the voters, have no confidence on any electronic system that can be accessed via wireless and is transmitted over the internet and thereby easily manipulated to skew results/outcome.

Do you have a backup plan if the systems break down and there are lines of voters waiting to vote? Or dare I say it—will there be stories like those out of Ohio.

Respectfully

Mary Clark